



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

COCHRAN FREUND  
& YOUNG LLC  
LSI CORPORATION  
2026 CARIBOU DRIVE  
SUITE 201  
FORT COLLINS CO 80525

**COPY MAILED**

**DEC 07 2009**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Balaji, et al. :  
Application No. 10/620,581 : DECISION  
Filed/Deposited: 15 July, 2003 :  
Attorney Docket No. LSI.197US01 (03-0773) :

This is a decision on the petition, filed on 11 September, 2009, for revival of an application abandoned due to unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

Any further petition to revive must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."

This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §704.

As to the Allegations  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee. (However, it does not appear that a terminal disclaimer and fee are due here.)

Petitioner does not appear to have addressed the showing/statement requirement(s) under the rule. This deficiency must be overcome.

**Petitioners attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II).**

### BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

Former Counsel (Sandeep Jaggi) failed to reply timely and properly to Notice of Allowance/Allowability and Fees Due mailed on 30 March, 2009, with reply due under a non-extendable deadline on or before 30 June, 2009.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 30 June, 2009.

It does not appear that the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment before a petition was filed.

On 11 September, 2009, Petitioner (William W. Cochran) filed, *inter alia*, a petition (with fee) under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), as a reply in the form of fees due, and averred unintentional delay as the basis for the petition. Notably, however, Petitioner was not the person under whose control the application appears to have gone abandoned, and Petitioner has not indicated that he has made an inquiry consistent with his duty to the Office failed to submit the reply required under the regulation.<sup>1</sup> (In the week of November 23-27, 2009, Petitioner's office called and inquired in this regard, and, further, indicated that it would file a supplementary statement in this matter. However, as of this writing no such statement appears of record in the IFW.).

The Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 24 September, 2009.

Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II).

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

<sup>2</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

As to Allegations of  
Unintentional Delay

As indicated above, the requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a proper reply, a proper statement and/or showing of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

As discussed above, it does not appear that Petitioner has satisfied the statement/showing requirement under the rule.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail:                      Mail Stop PETITION  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    P. O. Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                                    Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By facsimile:                **(571) 273-8300**  
                                    Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2<sup>3</sup>) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./  
John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>3</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

**§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of Petitioners or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.